

Amendment Dated **April 30, 2004**

Reply to Office Action of January 30, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-29 are pending in the application. By the Amendment, claims 1, 3-7, 9-16, 18-21, and 23-29 are amended. Support for the claims can be found in the original specification, including original claims and the figures, for example, page 7, lines 18-20, and page 17, lines 2-8. Applicants respectfully submit that none of the amendments raise new issues requiring further searching or consideration by the Examiner, as all the amendments relate to previously considered subject matter. Entry of the amended claims is therefore proper.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 21, and 23-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by Yeo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,831,945, hereinafter “Yeo”). Because Yeo fail to disclose all the features of the claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a video browsing system that includes features of a main screen which displays video segments corresponding to significant events showing a storyline relation between two displayed characters of said character screen according to a user selection, wherein said storyline relation may be constant or variable. Applicants respectfully submit that such features are not disclosed by Yeo.

The Office Action, at page 2, asserts that Yeo discloses every feature of claim 1, including that said “selection” may be constant or variable. In contrast, claim 1 recites that it is the “storyline relation” that may be constant or variable, a distinction which Applicants respectfully submit must be appreciated to understand the claimed invention. Yeo is directed to a video browser which Applicants respectfully submit includes means for identifying acts, scenes, and

shots, and locating scene transitions in video data, based upon cues from visual and temporal “relationships” contained in the video data. See Abstract, col. 2, lines 24-45, and col. 10, lines 48-58 of Yeo. Although the inventive video browser of Yeo may allow a user to recognize the underlying story structure of a video (Col. 2, lines 29-32), Applicants respectfully submit that video browser of Yeo does not define storyline relations in the context of constancy or variability of the same as between characters of a video. Thus, the video browser of Yeo does not include at least the features of a main screen which displays video segments corresponding to significant events showing a storyline relation between two displayed characters of said character screen according to a user selection, wherein said storyline relation may be constant or variable.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable. Independent claim 21, which is directed to a video browsing system that includes features of a video display configured to display video segments from the video, wherein the video segments correspond to events showing a storyline relationship between two displayed characters in said character menu, defines patentable subject matter for at least reasons similar to claim 1. Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, and 23-29, directly or indirectly, depend from claims 1 and 21, respectively, and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons, as well as additional patentable features recited therein, and the combinations thereof. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Amendment Dated **April 30, 2004**

Reply to Office Action of January 30, 2004

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 5, 8, 9, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yeo in view of Schein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,323,911, hereinafter "Schein"), and claims 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Schein and Yeo. Because the references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all the features of the claims, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 2, 5, 8, 9, and 22 depend from claims 1 and 21, respectively. Yeo fails to disclose or suggest at least features of the claims as set forth above. Applicants respectfully submit, and the Office Action, at page 9, acknowledges, that Schein also fails to disclose or suggest even a video browsing system. Thus, not even the combination of Yeo and Schein discloses or suggests a video browsing system that includes the features of a main screen which displays video segments corresponding to significant events showing a storyline relation between two displayed characters of said character screen according to a user selection, wherein said storyline relation may be constant or variable, with respect to claims 2, 5, 8, and 9, or a video browsing system that includes the features of a video display configured to display video segments from the video, wherein the video segments correspond to events showing a storyline relationship between two displayed characters in said character menu, with respect to claim 22.

With respect to claims 15-20, independent claim 15 defines patentable subject matter for at least reasons similar to claim 1. Claims 16-20 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 15, and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons, as well as additional patentable features recited therein, and the combinations thereof. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Amendment Dated **April 30, 2004**

Reply to Office Action of January 30, 2004

With respect to claims 12-14, independent claim 12 is directed to a video data structure tangibly embodied in a computer-readable medium for a video browsing system, that includes a semantic structure DS which includes additional information describing the video, wherein the semantic description includes information indicative of a storyline relation between objects in the video. For at least the reasons similar to the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 21, Applicants respectfully submit that such features are not disclosed or suggested by Schein, Yeo, or the combination thereof. Claims 13 and 14 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 12, and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons, as well as additional patentable features recited therein, and the combinations thereof. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Amendment Dated **April 30, 2004**

Reply to Office Action of January 30, 2004

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Garth D. Richmond**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carl R. Wesolowski, Esq.
Registration No. 40,372
Garth D. Richmond, Esq.
Registration No. 43,044

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703-766-3701 DYK/CRW/GDR:knv
Date: April 30, 2004

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610